



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

JIGJR.: 02-06

Paper No: \_\_

THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/  
BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP  
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY  
SUITE 1750  
ATLANTA GA 30339

**COPY MAILED**

**FEB 13 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Holt, et al. :  
Application No. 08/876,839 :  
Filed: 16 June, 1997 :  
Attorney Docket No. 192600780 :

**DECISION**

This is a decision on the petition filed on 3 January, 2006, under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a) is **DISMISSED**.

**NOTES:**

- (1) Any reply must include a renewed petition (and fee) must include a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 and must be submitted within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47";
- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

**BACKGROUND**

The record indicates:

- the instant application was filed on 16 June, 1997;
- through a series of amendments, incorporating priority claims, Petitioner avers that he seeks to amend claims to include subject matter to which Evan Krause (Mr. Krause) contributed (and so also alter the inventive entity pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.48);
- on 3 January, 2006, Petitioner Jeff Kuester (Reg. No. 34,367) filed, *inter alia*, the instant petition, an oath/declaration, which, notably, is not signed by any of the averred “signing” co-inventors—Scott Crandall Holt, Christopher Bertran Medders, Drina C. Yue, Raymond J. Smets, Thomas Joesph Moquin, Terry Durand and Lawrence R. Berke—as required by statute and regulation, or by the alleged non-signing inventor Mr. Krause;
- moreover, while Petitioner alleges that the entire application (description, claims, abstract and drawings) was transmitted to Mr. Krause, the transmittal letter provided clearly evidences that only the oath/declaration and the assignment were sent to Mr. Krause, and there is no documentation supporting a contention that he received an Email transmission and was able to download/read the attachments thereto.

#### ANALYSIS

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.47 provide in pertinent part:

**§ 1.47 Filing when an inventor refuses to sign or cannot be reached.**

(a) If a joint inventor refuses to join in an application for patent or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, the application may be made by the other inventor on behalf of himself or herself and the nonsigning inventor. The oath or declaration in such an application must be accompanied by a petition including proof of the pertinent facts, the fee set forth in § 1.17(h), and the last known address of the nonsigning inventor. The nonsigning inventor may subsequently join in the application by filing an oath or declaration complying with §1.63.

\* \* \*

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.63 provide in pertinent part:

**§1.63 Oath or declaration.**

(b) In addition to meeting the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section, the oath or declaration must also:

(1) Identify the application to which it is directed;

(2) State that the person making the oath or declaration has reviewed and understands the contents of the application, Including the claims, as amended by any amendment specifically referred to in the oath or declaration; and

(3) State that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in § 1.56.

When one alleges a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who, *inter alia*, presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made.

The commentary at MPEP §409.03(d) provides:

**409.03(d) Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**

**INVENTOR CANNOT BE REACHED**

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47, a statement of facts should be submitted that fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made.

The fact that a nonsigning inventor is on vacation or out of town and is therefore temporarily unavailable to sign the declaration is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47.

Furthermore, the fact that an inventor is hospitalized and/or is not conscious is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47. 37 C.F.R. §1.43 may be available under these circumstances. See MPEP §409.02. Such a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 will be dismissed as inappropriate.

The statement of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as internet searches, certified mail return receipts, cover letters of instructions, telegrams, that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the statement. The steps taken to locate the whereabouts of the nonsigning inventor should be included statement of facts. It is important that

the statement contain facts as opposed to conclusions.

## REFUSAL TO JOIN

A refusal by an inventor to sign an oath or declaration when the inventor has not been presented with the application papers does not itself suggest that the inventor is refusing to join the application unless it is clear that the inventor understands exactly what he or she is being asked to sign and refuses to accept the application papers. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney. The fact that an application may contain proprietary information does not relieve the 37 C.F.R. §1.47 applicant of the responsibility to present the application papers to the inventor if the inventor is willing to receive the papers in order to sign the oath or declaration. It is noted that the inventor may obtain a complete copy of the application, unless the inventor has assigned his or her interest in the application, and the assignee has requested that the inventor not be permitted access. See MPEP §106. It is reasonable to require that the inventor be presented with the application papers before a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 is granted since such a procedure ensures that the inventor is apprised of the application to which the oath or declaration is directed. In re Gray, 115 USPQ 80 (Comm'r Pat. 1956).

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the 37 C.F.R. §1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should

be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

Thus, not only must a copy of the entire application must be sent to the last known address of the non-signing inventor (or the estate representative) with a request that he/she sign the declaration for the patent application—and evidence of that transmittal submitted—but also a reasonable effort must be made to ascertain a current or last known address, and the petition (with fee) must state over the signature and registration number of the Petitioner the last known address and, if appropriate, evidence of the due diligence effort ascertaining same.

Alternatively, an oath or declaration for the patent application in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.63 and 1.64 must be presented.

(The declaration must set forth the inventor's residence, citizenship and post office address. An oath or declaration in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.63 and 1.64 signed by the Rule 1.47 applicant is required.<sup>1</sup>)

### CONCLUSION

The record as it stands is deficient as to document support for the averment of transmittal of the entire application (description, claims, abstract and drawings) to the non-signing inventor at current/valid (or at least last-known/ascertainable) addresses. The evidence of these requirements should be submitted with any renewed petition. Moreover, the requirement for the filing of an oath/declaration executed by the “signing” inventors does not appear to have been satisfied.

Therefore, the instant petition hereby is dismissed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See: MPEP 409.03(b).

<sup>2</sup> On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number changed to (571) 273-8300. Faxes sent to the old number are not longer routed to the new number, and (571) 273-8300 is the only facsimile number recognized for centralized delivery. (For further information. see: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/cfax062005.pdf>.)

By mail: Commissioner for Patents<sup>3</sup>  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: IFW Formal Filings  
(571) 273-8300  
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand: Mail Stop: Petition  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>3</sup> To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).